



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,819	03/18/2004	Rae Ellen Syverson	KCC 4749.1 (K-C 16,858.1)	7018
45736 7590 06/12/2008 Christopher M. Goff (27839) ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE SUITE 2600 ST. LOUIS, MO 63102			EXAMINER CHANNAVAJJALA, LAKSHMI SARADA	
			ART UNIT 1611	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/12/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USpatents@armstrongteasdale.com

DETAILED ACTION

Receipt of RCE, amendment, remarks all dated 3-6-08, IDS dated 4-10-08 and IDS dated 4-10-08 and 4-22-08 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-10, 12-13 and 15-60 are pending. Claims 5, 12, 13 and 26-60 have been withdrawn as being non-elected. Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 15-25 have been examined previously.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3-6-08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 7 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Instant claims recite the term "at least about" with respect to the amount of the active agents, which is indefinite. The terms "at least" and "about" contradict with each other because the term "at least" sets a lower limit of the active agent and term "about" refers to a value in the vicinity. Thus, it is not clear if the lower limit is at least the said value or in the vicinity of the said value.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 15-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robbins et al. (J. Clin. Microbiol. 1987) and Lambert (J Applied Microbiol.) in view of US 5,612,045 to Syverson or Syverson in view of Robbins et al and Lambert.

Robbins et al studied the production of toxic shock syndrome toxin 1 by *Staphylococcus aureus* (*S. aureus*) as determined by tampon-disk-membrane- agar method. Robbins et al teach that the occurrence of toxic shock syndrome due to infection or colonization of *S. aureus* and its association with the use of tampons in menstruating women (page 1446, col. 1). Robbins et al observed that tampons of different materials supported characteristic levels of growth and toxin production by *S. aureus* (table 1, page 1447 and results on page 1448, col. 1). Robbins et al conclude that the tampons provide a fibrous surface for heavy colonization by *S. aureus* and also observed a decrease in toxic shock syndrome toxin (TSST) production by inhibiting the growth of *S. aureus* by additives such as surfactants (last column on page 1449).

Robbins fails to teach the first active ingredient of the instant claims.

Lambert studied the minimum inhibitory concentrations of different antimicrobial compounds against *S. aureus* and observed that phenoxyethanol and phenyl ethyl alcohol (designated as PoE and PeA respectively) are effective against *S. aureus* (abstract, page 276, col. 1, table 2, page 278, col. 2 and Discussion), even though the

MICs vary with the inoculum levels. Lambert does not teach phenoxyethanol on a non-absorbent article as claimed in the instant invention.

Syverson teaches absorbent articles and non-absorbent articles (col. 3, lines 55-60) such as catamenial tampons for absorbing body fluids that include an effective amount of a compound that substantially inhibits the production of exoprotein produced by Gram positive bacteria, particularly produced by *S. Aureus* (abstract, col. 3, lines 40-60). The compounds of Syverson comprise ethers, which are the same as the elected sub-species of the instant claims (col. 3, lines 61-55). Syverson teaches including effective amounts of ether compounds and combinations of other antimicrobial or antibacterial compounds (col. 5).

It would have been obvious for one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to use the antibacterial phenoxyethanol of Lambert, which is effective against *S. aureus*, together with ether compounds in the articles of Syverson because Robbins et al teach *S. aureus* causes toxic shock syndrome in women using tampons and Syverson suggests employing compounds that for inhibiting toxic shock syndrome (caused by *S. aureus*) on devices such as tampons. Alternatively, Syverson does not teach the claimed first active agent. However, it would have been obvious for one of an ordinary skill in the art at time of the instant invention to incorporate phenoxyethanol of Lambert in the article of Syverson because Lambert teaches phenoxyethanol is effective against *S. aureus* and Robbins teaches inhibition of *S. aureus* toxin production by adding the inhibitors on tampons. In this regard, Robbins et al show that the toxin production does not depend on the type of article (tampon) used. Further, optimizing the

amounts of ether (of Syverson) and phenoxyethanol of Lambert, with an expectation to provide the optimum inhibitory effect of *S. aureus* toxin production would have been within the scope of a skilled artisan.

The Double Patenting Rejection of record over 09/969,299 is no longer present because the application has been abandoned. Applicants' arguments regarding the teachings of D'Augustine are moot because the reference is no longer applicable.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 3-6-08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants' detailed arguments, not reproduced here, have been considered but not found persuasive.

Applicants agree that according to Robbins, one function of tampons may be to support the vaginal infection by supplying a fibrous surface for heavy colonization and to provide a sufficiently aerobic environment for toxin production. However, they argue that the product tested by Robbins, Aqualon, does not inhibit TSST-1 production when blood was added. However, the argument is not persuasive because Robbins was only cited for the fact that the occurrence of toxic shock syndrome due to infection or colonization of *S. aureus* and its association with the use of tampons in menstruating women.

It is argued that, the method developed in Lambert may be used to quantify the effect in the region between reversible and irreversible damage, or sub-lethal injury to cell death; that it was found in Lambert that phenethyl alcohol is a better inhibitor than phenoxyethanol against *S. aureus*. The arguments are not persuasive because the teaching of Lambert that phenethyl alcohol is superior to phenoxyethanol does not lead to the conclusion that the latter is not effective in inhibiting *S. aureus*. It is argued that both Robbins et al. and Lambert fail to disclose the use of phenoxyethanol (or any compound having the structure of the first active ingredient as required in claim i) on a non- absorbent substrate being selected from the group consisting of a non-absorbent incontinence device, a barrier birth control device, a tampon applicator, and a douche for insertion into the vagina for inhibiting exoproteins from Gram positive bacteria. The argument is not persuasive because the teachings of Robbins have been explained above and Lambert teaches phenoxyethanol as one of the compounds that has an inhibitory effect on *S. aureus*. It is argued that Syverson teaches absorbent articles and not non-absorbent articles. Applicants' arguments are not persuasive because Syverson teaches both absorbent and non-absorbent articles with *S. aureus* exoprotein inhibiting compounds. Applicants' attention is directed to col. 3, lines 50-60, where it is states that the tampons may be absorbent or non-absorbent. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention that exoprotein inhibiting compounds may be applied on both absorbent as well as nonabsorbent articles and still achieve the desired inhibitory activity. One of an ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include phenoxyethanol of Lambert on the non-absorbent

Art Unit: 1611

articles of Syverson with a reasonable expectation that phenoxyethanol is effective in inhibiting the exoprotein produced by *S. aureus* because Robbins admittedly teaches tampons support vaginal infections such as those caused by *S. aureus* by supplying a fibrous surface and that suggests inhibitors for inhibiting exoprotein production. It would have been reasonable for one of an ordinary skill in the art to expect that *S. aureus* exoprotein production can be inhibited by any inhibitor, including the phenoxyethanol of Lambert, to exhibit such activity.

6. This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 10/803,819. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1611

the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lakshmi S. Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-0591. The examiner can normally be reached on 9.00 AM -5.30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lakshmi S Channavajjala/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1611
May 25, 2008